

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in this application. In the Office Action, Claims 1, 18, 19 and 30 were objected to for an informality of using the words “can be provided”; Claims 19 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as his invention; Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by publication number US 2003/0223604 A1 of Nakagawa; Claims 9-10 and 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,937,852 to Pehrsson and further in view of publication number US 2003/0008689 A1 of Uda; and Claims 19-26 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa and “further in view of Pehrsson.”

The finding in the Office Action of allowable subject matter has been found in Claims 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 27, 28 and 29 is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 19 and 30 have been amended. No new matter is presented.

It is believed that the amendment to Claims 1, 8, 19 and 30, which replaces the words “that can be provided” with the word “provided,” overcomes the objection to these claims.

In regard to the rejection of Claims 19 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, the Office Action states that “the language used in lines 10-11 ‘determining whether the first and second service are provided as the concurrent service if the first and second services are not provided concurrently’, makes the limitation confusing.” (Office Action, page 2.) It is believed that the amendment Claims 19 and 30 overcomes this rejection. Similar amendments have been made to Claims 1 and 8. The amendment of Claims 9 and 10 corrects typographical errors.


Claims 1, 8, 9, 19 and 30 are the pending independent claims. Each independent claim was rejected in view of Nakagawa, either alone or with another reference. However, in view of the enclosed Rule 131 Declaration, Nakagawa is not a valid prior art reference.¹

¹ It is also submitted that the citation to Nakagawa, at page 3 of Office Action, as qualifying as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is incorrect, at least because Nakagawa was not “described in a printed publication ... more than one year prior to the date” of the filing of this instant application.

Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1, 8, 9, 19 and 30 must be withdrawn. Without conceding the patentability per se of Claims 1-7, 10-18 and 20-29, the claims are allowable at least in view of their dependency therefrom.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-30, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, it is requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant(s)

The Farrell Law Firm, P.C.
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Suite 701
Uniondale, NY 11553
Tel: (516) 228-3565

Enclosure: 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 DECLARATION OF PRIOR INVENTION
MADE IN THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA TO OVERCOME
CITED PATENT PUBLICATION